

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/783,236	GREENBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George R. Evanisko	3762	

All Participants:

 (1) George R. Evanisko.

 (2) Tomas Lendvai.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 11 October 2007
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
112 second rejection
Claims discussed:
1 and dependent claims
Prior art documents discussed:
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: To modify claim 1 to include the array of electrodes, mounting aperture, reinforced area, and strain relief slot on the flexible body to make the claim a complete claim and not just a listing of parts. In addition, the "mounting location" was changed to "mounting aperture" and the strain relief slot was described as adjacent to the reinforcing area, and the reinforcing area was further clarified since the combination of aperture, slot, and area and how they relate was determined to be novel by the examiner. The previous claimed use of: a "mounting location" could be ANY part of the device; the reinforced area is a relative term; and the relief slot could be read as just a hole used in the prior art for applying a tack (such as Suaning or Chow)--therefore the claim was amended. In addition, claim 72 was canceled since the ferromagnetic keeper was not disclosed as being used with an aperture or reinforced area. .